

Claims 1-11 are now presented for examination.

Claims 1-3, 5-8 and 11 have been amended to define still more clearly what Applicant regards as his invention, in terms which distinguish over the art of record, and in particular to overcome the formal rejection. The title has been amended to make it more descriptive, as required in the Office Action.

Claims 1 and 7 are independent.

Claims 1, 2, 6 and 11 were objected to due to informalities. As shown above, Applicant has amended the claims in the manner suggested by the Examiner. Withdrawal of the objection is requested.

Claims 3, 5 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as indefinite. As shown the claims have been carefully reviewed and amended as deemed necessary to ensure that they comply fully with Section 112, second paragraph. For example, in Claim 8, it has been made even more clear that the level detected by the detection means is a logic level of the data line arranged between the personal computer and the camera. It is believed that the rejection under Section 112, second paragraph, has been obviated, and its withdrawal is therefore respectfully requested.

Claims 1-3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,594,672 (Hicks). Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious from Hicks. Claims 4 and 5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious from Hicks in view of U.S. Patent 5,475,441 (Parulski et al.). Claims 7-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a)

as obvious from Hicks in view of U.S. Patent 5,438,359 (Aoki).

As shown above, independent Claims 1 and 7 have been amended to recite Applicant's invention more clearly. Applicant submits that the amended independent Claims are patentable for at least the following reasons.

Independent Claim 1 is directed to a peripheral apparatus which can be connected to a computer apparatus. The detecting means detects the voltage level of a signal line connected to the personal computer. The power supply control means controls the supply of electric power from the power source to the predetermined circuit in accordance with the output of the detecting means. The discriminating means determines whether or not a communication request for a predetermined procedure has been received from the personal computer after the electric power of the power source was supplied to the predetermined circuit by the power supply control means. The discriminating means detects the voltage level of the data line connected to the personal computer and is powered by the personal computer via the data line. The control means allows the supply of electric power from the power supply to continue once the discriminating means discriminates the presence of the communication request.

Independent Claim 7 is directed to a camera which can be connected to a computer apparatus. The recording means records a photographed image. The detecting means detects the level of a data line which is connected to a personal computer. The discriminating means judges whether

or not an input signal is a predetermined command from the personal computer. The image output means outputs image data recorded by the recording means to the personal computer. The control means starts the supply of electric power to the recording means and the image output means according to the detected result of the detecting means, and then controls the supply of the electric power according to the discrimination result of the discriminating means so as to continue the supply of electric power once the predetermined command is discriminated by the discriminating means, and to stop in the case where the predetermined command is not discriminated by the discriminating means.

Claims 1 and 7 have been amended to recite more clearly that the discrimination means detects the voltage level of the signal line (data line in Claim 7) connected to the personal computer and is powered by the personal computer via the signal line (data line in Claim 7).

As understood by Applicant, Hicks teaches a power saving device arranged between, and connected to, both a host computer and a peripheral device. When the power saving device detects data present at the output port of the host computer, the power saving device supplies power to the peripheral device thereby allowing the peripheral device to receive the data (see col. 4, line 50 to col. 5, line 5). Power to the peripheral device is turned off when data has not been detected at the output port of the host device for a predetermined period of time (see col. 1, lines 65-67). Therefore, the power saving device of Hicks must itself be

powered at all times in order to detect whether or not the host computer has data to be sent to the peripheral device.

In Hicks, power is supplied to power saver 17 through power source cord 4, which is separate from data line 13 connected to personal computer 1.

*Arguments
directed
toward
added
limitations*

Hicks is distinguishable from Applicant's invention at least because nothing is found in Hicks to teach or suggest the discriminating means that detects the voltage level of the signal line (data line in Claim 7) connected to the personal computer and that is powered by the personal computer via the same signal line (data line in Claim 7).

Further, as understood by Applicant and as stated in the Office Action in paragraphs 7 and 8, both Parulski et al. and Aoki merely teach a camera that can be connected to a personal computer. However, neither Parulski et al. nor Aoki, either taken separately or in combination with Hicks, teaches or suggests the implementation of power saving in a camera as recited in Applicant's invention. Therefore, these references fail to remedy the above-mentioned deficiencies of Hicks as a reference against the independent claims.

A review of the other art of record has failed to reveal anything which, in Applicant's opinion, would remedy the deficiencies of the art discussed above, as references against the independent claims herein. Those claims are therefore believed patentable over the art of record.

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one or another of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the

same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

This Amendment After Final Rejection is believed clearly to place this application in condition for allowance and its entry is therefore believed proper under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116. At the very least, however, it is believed clear that the formal rejections have been overcome. Accordingly, entry of this Amendment After Final Rejection, as an earnest effort to advance prosecution and reduce the number of issues, is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All

correspondence should continue to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

Joseph W. Ragusa
Attorney for Applicant

Registration No. 38,586

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

F502\A644851\MW